

REMARKS

Claims 2, 4-9, 15, and 17-22 are pending, and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,731,844 ("Rauch"). Applicants have amended claims 2, 4-6, 15, and 17-19 to clarify the claimed subject matter. These amendments are fully supported by the application as filed, and do not add new matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants maintain that Rauch fails to teach each and every element of pending independent claims 2 and 15. However, in order to advance prosecution of this application, applicants have amended independent claims 2 and 15. As amended, each of independent claims 2 and 15 requires a program grid that includes a plurality of navigation points simultaneously displayed within a portion of the program guide defined by at least one of the program information cells in the program grid. Each of the plurality of the navigation points is associated with predefined criteria, and program information corresponding to programs that satisfy the predefined criteria for a navigation point is displayed in response to a user selection of the navigation point. Rauch fails to describe this subject matter.

First, Rauch fails to describe a plurality of navigation points simultaneously displayed within a portion of the program guide defined by at least one of the program information cells in a program grid. In particular, the time and channel scroll bars of FIG. 2 of Rauch cannot reasonably be construed as "navigation points" because neither of them is displayed within a portion of the grid defined by at least one program information cell. As recited in claims 2 and 15, a program information cell is "for presenting information associated with a first subset of a plurality of channel and time cells." Even under the Examiner's interpretation of a "cell" (which applicants reserve a right to refute), one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize a channel and a time scroll bar as being located within a portion of a program grid defined by cells for presenting information associated with a first subset of a plurality of channel and time cells.

Second, the channel and time scroll bars of Rauch are not themselves associated with predefined criteria. In particular, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's contention that variation in content of the grid in FIG. 2 of Rauch "based on...time selected by the time scroll bar 224, [and] channel selected by the channel scroll bar 226" (Office Action, 4) is the same selection of programs based on predefined criteria. One skilled in the art would recognize that a scroll bar is provided in

order to allow a user to *manually* access information that is not displayed on a screen due to space limitations of the screen. Specifically, any "new" information displayed in response to scrolling is determined by the extent of manual movement of the scroll by the user, and not by any predetermined criteria associated with the selected scroll bar itself. In this instance, even though the content of the grid in Rauch varies according to the time and channel selections made using the scroll bars, these variations are not the result of predefined criteria associated with the scroll bar.

Finally, although the Examiner contends, at various points in the office action, that day selector 220 and topics selector button 254 in FIG. 2 of Rauch correspond to "navigation cells", the Examiner does not provide any reasoning to support this contention. In the context of the amended claims, day selector 220 and topics selector button 254 cannot reasonably be construed as navigation points for at least the reason that they are not located within a portion of the grid defined by at least one of the program information cells in the grid.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Rauch fails to teach each and every element of amended independent claims 2 and 15. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 15. Applicants also request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-9 and 17-22, which depend from claims 2 and 15, for at least the same reasons.

In view of the above amendment, applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicants believe they have provided for fees due with this response. However, if additional fees are due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-1075, under Order No. 003597-0001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By _____/Regina Sam/
Regina Sam
Registration No.: L0381
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 75563
Attorneys/Agents For Applicants